IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of   Ron M. Redlich, et al.

Serial No.   09/916,397   Examiner Michael J. Pyzocha

Filed: July 27, 2001   Group 2137

For: Data Security System and Method

AMENDMENT

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This responds to the Office Action dated April 5, 2005. Applicant restricts this application

to Group II, claims 48 - 101; 153 - 160, and 224 - 234 and provisionally elects to prosecute species

(b), claims 63 - 77, 90 - 101 and 224 - 234 wherein species (b) claims recite, in the preamble, "a

computer network with one or more security sensitive words, characters or icons," or "an

information processing system for securing data having one or more security sensitive words,

characters or icons in a computer network." The examiner stated "Applicant is required under 35

U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall

be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable."

Applicant is hopeful that a generic claim will be deemed allowable in order to encompass

other claims beyond the provisionally elected species of species (b), claims 63 - 77, 90 - 101 and 224

- 234. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the examiner's characterization between species (a) ("a

group of security sensitive words..") contrasted with species (b) ("one or more security sensitive

words.."). The difference between species (a) and species (b) is that, in species (b), the preamble

recites "one or more security sensitive words, characters or icons". In species (a), the claims recite

"establishing a group of security sensitive words, characters or icons." The step of "establishing"

is not present in species (b). This is not a traverse.

[Page left blank]